

To the Honorable Commissioners of the FCC,

I am writing to you today to comment on Docket No. 02-277, The Biennial Review of the FCC's broadcast media ownership rules. I am voicing my support to retain all the FCC rules in question. These rules set limits on concentration of the broadcast industry and serve the public interest by preserving diversity of ownership in the broadcast marketplace. These rules are; The Television-Radio Cross-Ownership Rule, The Broadcast-Newspaper Cross Ownership Ban, The National Television Ownership Rule, The Duopoly Rule for Radio, The Local Television Ownership Rule, and The Dual Network Rule.

The great privilege to carry on informed debate and discussion of current events, both locally and globally, is part of the founding philosophy of this country. If the avenues for sharing information are restricted to very few, then I fear that the quality of the information presented will decay. What is the value of varied information sources when they are controlled by a single voice?

As a creator of independent media, I know first hand the importance of freedom of expression. The ability to say things that are potentially challenging to audiences at large, or possibly critical of society's sacred cows and special interests, lies at the heart of the independent media maker's business. Already it is difficult to work outside the established system. If the channels to a potential audience - be they cable programming channels, local television stations, or even newspapers that promote and review independent works - fall into the hands of even fewer corporate owners, sharing my work or the work of any independent artist will become much harder.

In such an environment, the commercial interest inevitably compromises the public interest. The FCC has rules limiting ownership to preserve the ecology of a healthy marketplace of ideas. If the FCC undermines this ecology by removing the rules, it undermines the future health of the marketplace of information.

Congress and the Supreme Court have long recognized that a functioning democracy depends on a media open to independent and unconventional news and a varied entertainment media. Media makers working outside the corporate environment continually provide content that is so defined. This unconventionality and variety that stimulates the American people both causes us to constantly question the status quo, and facilitates the ability of Americans to speak with one another. If we exist in an environment in which our news outlets have merged together, both print and broadcast, our ability to open informed discussion is restricted.

I urge you to rule in the public interest on this matter. The public interest will be served by preserving the FCC's Broadcast Media ownership rules. On another note I feel that the act that does not allow for live webstreaming on the internet by noncommercial radio stations is clearly undemocratic. As a Disc Jockey on a noncommercial station and as a United States citizen I personally feel as if my freedom of speech has been violated. By not allowing webstreaming my voice, along with many others, can not be heard by many people. The internet, like every other medium developed in history, has been taken into the arms of big business and we are taught to not even question it. I can't be the only person to raise the question: Shouldn't the internet be a tool of democracy? If it were then all radio stations could broadcast to the same amount of people, which would truly be a step towards democracy.

I appreciate you taking time out to read this.
Thank you,

Mike Newman
4 Canterbury Ln.
Belle Mead, NJ 08502